THE

INDISSOLUBLE NATURE

OF THE

AMERICAN UNION,

CONSIDERED IN CONNECTION WITH THE ASSUMED RIGHT OF SECESSION.

A LETTER

TO HON. PETER COOPER, NEW YORK.

BY NAHUM CAPEN.

BOSTON:
A. WILLIAMS AND COMPANY.
NEW YORK: ROSS AND TOUSEY.
1862.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
State of Indiana through the Indiana State Library

http://www.archive.org/details/indissolublenatu00cape

THE

INDISSOLUBLE NATURE

OF THE

AMERICAN UNION,

CONSIDERED IN CONNECTION WITH THE ASSUMED RIGHT OF SECESSION.

A LETTER

TO HON. PETER COOPER, NEW YORK.

BY NAHUM CAPEN.

BOSTON:
A. WILLIAMS AND COMPANY.
NEW YORK: ROSS AND TOUSEY.
1862.

New York, May 18, 1861.

Dear Sir: I received your esteemed favor, and unite with you in heartfelt sorrow to find our country involved in an unnatural and disgraceful conflict — a conflict between brethren bound together as we are by every consideration of interest and duty to preserve the integrity of a Union intended never to be broken. This Union has given us peace and prosperity at home, with honor and respect throughout the world. This Union is worth preserving at any and every cost of life and treasure, not only for the benefits it is calculated to bring to the people of the North, but also for the greater benefits it has secured, and will continue to secure, to our brethren of the South.

It is a most lamentable sight to see such a treasure — such a pearl of great price — cast on the uncertain chances of a demoralizing and desolating war; a war that has grown entirely out of false notions of interest, and the long-continued misrepresentations by which our Southern neighbors have been persuaded to believe that we of the North were determined to make war upon an institution, that, in their opinion, we did not understand, and could not appreciate.

A more fatal error never controlled a great community. So far from any considerable number of the people of the North desiring to interfere with the institutions of the South, they are, as a body, now, and ever have been, determined to secure to them every right which they can claim either legally or equitably under the Constitution of the United States. When this fact shall come to be brought home to their understandings, they will see at once that there is no cause for quarrel between us.

As a nation our interests are mutual. One member cannot suffer without an injury to the whole body to which it belongs.

With our nation united, we shall remain strong and respected; with it torn and dissevered, we make a necessity for standing armies, which will eat out our strength, and tempt the world to take advantage of our weakness and folly as a nation.

I sincerely hope that you will give to our distracted country the benefit of your long and arduous study in the science and philosophy of our government. It is the only government calculated to secure the reward of labor to the hand that earns it.

Your compliance with this request will, I trust, diffuse correct knowledge, and promote the cause of peace, and will much oblige

Your friend,

PETER COOPER.

Nahum Capen, Esq.

THE

INDISSOLUBLE NATURE

OF

THE AMERICAN UNION.

Mount Ida, Dorchester, Nov. 1, 1861.

My dear Sir: —

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your patriotic letter; and, if my response has been delayed beyond the ordinary limits of a prompt correspondent, I beg that you will impute the delay rather to my serious hesitation in complying with a request so fraught with considerations of grave difficulty, than to any indifference to the momentous issues which now agitate, and threaten the very existence of, that beloved Union, which so long has been the subject of your study and deep solicitude.

It was my first and natural impulse to refer you to the teachings of men distinguished for their talents and learning in public affairs, and who were favorably known to the people as judicious advisers; but such a course seemed too much like an evasion of duty, to be commendable in a citizen when his country was in danger; and, whether his views were or were not deemed worthy of consideration, their promulgation, it was certain, could effect no possible harm, if it accomplished no good. I am but a student, deeply impressed with a lively consciousness of my inability to teach the full meaning of the eventful lessons which are daily permitted by an All-wise Providence; and when I communicate opinions upon subjects which involve causes constituting the great machinery of the past and future of humanity, I submit them, *Deo juvante*, as simple endeavors to fathom the deep wells of truth, to be counted only as they may be regarded useful aids to reflection. Besides, but few are ignorant of the difficulty of speaking profitably on great topics of general interest within the compass of a letter, when their proper statement and elucidation would require a volume. A cursory view, therefore, is all that can be attempted.

Conditions of National Growth.

Intelligently to discuss the affairs or difficulties of a nation, it is indispensably requisite that we should first have clear and distinct views of *the conditions of national growth.* All nations have each their distinctive growth according to general laws, and every nation has its own circle of peculiar influences, or causes, which must be carefully traced to their origin and understood in their diversified relations, even to warrant a reasonable hope of success in the application of remedial means for complicated or long-continued derangements.

What constitutes a Nation.

In speaking of a nation, it is understood that we speak of a people of a common origin, of the same language, of similar views, habits, and tastes, acting under an accepted government of their own. In speaking of a nation, we speak of a people inhabiting a particular territory, who, from high motives of convenience or protection, interest or advancement, have agreed to act together. Such an organization of society is ultimate in its character. It proclaims its own boundaries, defines its own prerogatives, and establishes its own government. Although its origin and growth seem to be made up of accidental, unconnected, and dissimilar elements, or causes, yet a more extended inquiry will discover the beautiful truth that all nations emanate from the bosom of society according to great and unchangeable laws. As the various faculties make up the mind, or the man, so various men, or classes of men, make up the nation. The aggregate stands as a distinct part of creation, an element in the chemistry of civilization, and is to be counted a fact in history, and may be regarded by itself, or viewed in the successive and varied combinations developed by its progress. The sources of its diversity are the sources of its completeness and power; and such an organization has its distinct mission, and draws its nutriment from the events and changes of the physical and mental worlds as systematically and naturally as plants and trees draw nutrition from the earth.

Nations not formed by Chance.

A nation is no accident. The growth of a nation does not happen by chance. The character of a nation is left to no uncertainty. The continuance of a nation does not depend upon human wisdom. The age of a nation is not appointed by man. It is not within the province of man to give existence to a nation, either by edict or by legislation. He is only a humble agent in the hands of his Creator to aid in the great process of its development. He can neither make nor destroy, and yet by his means

failures are caused and successes demonstrated. Men, and associations of men, succeed only as they become discoverers of great truths, and faithfully apply them in practice.

Subdivisions of Society and Self-Government.

A nation is a combined system of public action, where the general good is paramount to special interests, and, like all other systems, is dependent upon its own peculiar means of self-protection and outward advancement. As it is made up of multitudes of intelligent beings, of varying races, grades, and conditions of men, the mode of practical development and coöperation often becomes complicated, and duty a difficult problem. The subdivisions of society are seen to be an obvious necessity. In no other way can human agency be made available; and hence the great variety of modifications to be found under different and under the same forms of government. Self-government is the highest form. "It was to obtain and preserve this inestimable blessing," as you remarked in a speech at a public meeting more than twenty years ago, "that the good and great have struggled with every form of opposition in every age of the world." Its very terms assert the highest duty and responsibility. They not only imply the necessity of self-knowledge and a capacity of self-control, but a comprehensive knowledge of wants and the best means of supplying them. It claims the highest condition of aggregated ability, and the sources of control in all its parts, separately and together. Every man, family, town, county, state, and section becomes a part. Every class, whether as a race or representing a particular cause, or interest, becomes a part; and it is to the conflicts of these parts that we are to look for the developments of principle and for the means of adjusting differences. It is the legitimate function of each part first to assert itself, itself only, and then to pass to the next and higher process of action and duty — that of combination, or union of parts. Upon this principle the republic is based; and, as its great power and strength come from its subdivisions of territory, population, interests, and duties, the nicest system of adjustment becomes of vital importance. Neglect of any part to itself, or of any parts to one another; any permitted inequality, any injustice whatever, whether directly designed or indirectly permitted, would not only introduce elements of discord and cause positive derangement, but render national unity utterly impossible.

"As in organic beings," says Niebuhr, "the most perfect life is that which animates the greatest variety of members, so, among States, that is the most perfect in which a number of institutions, originally distinct, being organized each after its kind into centres of national life, form a complete whole." But, as the foundations of a republic are to be found in the immutable principles of justice, practically secured by the subdivisions of society, so the superstructure is to be found in the

Great Principle of Union.

Union represents a great principle, inasmuch as it is a creative necessity. It results from the nature of things. It is the physiology of active and combined existence. Parts have a separate growth, a separate function, that they may be preserved in their integrity, as it is by the perfection of the parts that the perfect whole is accomplished. The human body, in its highest perfection and beauty, depends upon the completeness of its parts. The same is true of all animals, and of all organized matter. Without union, production and progress would be impossible in every department of nature. Without union completed by the perfection of parts, the phenomena of nature would cease, and cause and effect would be disjoined, — indeed, in time the world would become a blank. The farmer would be lost for the want of a soil and a seed time; the botanist and florist could have no standard of classification, nor vocabulary of beauty; the inventor would be stopped in his discoveries, and the mechanic in his labors; the mariner would lose his chart and look upon a pointless compass; the surgeon would have no occasion for anatomical subjects, and the physician no health or unity of function to preserve; the attorney would be paralyzed by the isolations of his brief; and when nothing remained to be taught concerning the harmonious union and action of the immortal soul, the vocation of the clergy would cease to be found in the list of human wants. The "effusive source of evidence and truth" would be closed to the philosopher, and the sphere of beauty and sublimity to the poet; the painter would become blind to all combinations of colors, and the musician deaf to all harmonies. Indeed, when we contemplate the wide world, and the immeasurable world of worlds, in its vast and comprehensive unity, we cannot but exclaim, in the language of the poet, —

> "I cannot go
> Where universal Love not smiles around,
> Sustaining all yon orbs, and all their suns;
> From seeming Evil still educing Good,
> And better thence again, and better still,
> In infinite progression."

But this principle of union so universally marked in the vast scale of creation is to be found in its greatest magnitude in the growth of nations. What is true of the whole creation must be true of nations, which make only a part. Nationality comprehends the conditions and relations of human activity; and without union, subordinated to sovereignty, national strength and grandeur would be impossible. To illustrate this it would be easy to cite numerous

Examples from History.

But the narrow limits of a letter necessarily preclude more than a general allusion to them. Of the ancient Republics of Greece

and Rome too little is known to enable the student to trace, in profitable detail, the sources of their varying strength or weakness, their tendencies to union or to dissolution. Their want, however, of a common standard of principle, of systematic subordination of parts, of practicable views of sovereignty, of sufficient diversity for completeness of harmony, and of broad and comprehensive views of individual character and of public duty, will show conclusively, in a general way, the elements of their unions and the causes of their changes and dissolutions. The same unvarying processes are continued during all time, but with new progressive elements of power. Respecting the state of Europe for a long period after the fall of the Roman Empire history offers but little instruction. "In Italy, more than elsewhere," writes Sismondi, "the principle of life remained in the fragments of the broken colossus: the Italians succumbed as a nation, but the component parts of their grand social union, their cities and towns, the first elements, in some sort, of what forms a nation, arose and defended themselves on their own account; every smaller association of men, which had survived the great one, had the courage to exist for itself, to feel that it had interests to protect, sentiments above fear, and virtues that deserved success."

If the Italian Republics were destined only to a temporary growth, it must be remembered that they served as schools of instruction first within their own limits, until they were prepared in various ways to spread civilization over the rest of Europe. In the growth and revolutions of France, Spain, Switzerland, Germany, indeed, of all nations that have existed and have been made known by history, we find the same great laws of association leading to strength and grandeur, and of their abrogation when the mission of nationality has ceased, or is in the process of change from a lower to a higher standard. If we turn to the primitive periods of England, Wales, Ireland, and Scotland, we shall find all the requisite subdivisions of society so important for separate action and training for ultimate and efficient union. We shall find instructive illustrations showing how strength depends upon diversity, and how various and well timed are the sources of national completeness. We shall find the principles which control the great process of colonization, and which give birth and existence to new germs of nationality in distant circles of political organization. We shall be led to consider, in connection,

England and America.

Although every nation contributes more or less to the means of growth of every other nation, yet, in tracing the origin of the institutions of America, we look more to England than to all other countries. There, nearly a thousand years ago, in the time of Alfred, in principle, were laid the foundations of the new republic on the American continent. The scale of progress, it must be

remembered, is infinite; and when we humbly endeavor to seek out the indistinct sources which give origin to a nation, we find them scattered through long tracts of time, though imperfectly marked by the pen of history. A comprehensive survey of the past, so far as it is possible by the aids of history, will enable us in some degree to understand the progressive tides of principle which prepared and established the American Union, not according to any plan of man, but as ordered by Infinite Wisdom. Even before the period of the Norman conqueror, we shall find it profitable to study the Anglo-Saxon character and institutions, that we may discover the elements of the great principles which were to be more fully developed by the American nation. "In the political system of the Saxon, royal or republican," says a distinguished writer,* "the danger has ever been in excess of either the centripetal force on the one hand, or the centrifugal on the other. Whatever variations there may have been from time to time, this may, I believe, safely be pronounced the great Saxon characteristic — a habit of *local government* exercised in a certain subordination, or rather relation, to a central government. And further, it would not be difficult to discover in such distribution of power in local institutions much of the discipline, the training for more expanded opportunities of government, which has helped onward what appears to be the destiny of the race. Observe how, after the Saxon occupation of Britain, the conquered territory, small comparatively in extent, was divided into several petty kingdoms, those loosely-compacted kingly commonwealths which were to form the heptarchy; and again, how each of these was parcelled out into those various divisions — the counties, shires, hundreds, tithings, and other partitions, the origin of which perplexes the antiquarian. The old Saxon spirit of *local independence* and authority animated the local institutions, assemblies, tribunals of various kinds, with an energy that never could have been developed under a strongly controlling central power. When the Norman conqueror sought to complete the subjugation of England, by introducing the laws and institutions of his own country, and a rigorous establishment of the feudal system, all this Saxon variety of law, of usage, of manners, and of men, was a perpetual hinderance, which it was a part of the Conquest to do away with."

"It is curious to observe," says Lord Campbell,† "that notwithstanding the sweeping changes of laws and institutions introduced at the Conquest, the characteristic difference between the Frenchmen and Englishmen, in the management of local affairs, still exists after the lapse of so many centuries; and that while with us parish vestries, town councils, and county sessions are the organs of the petty confederated republics into which England is parcelled out, — in France, whether the form of government be nominally monarchical or republican, no one can alter the direction of a

* Professor Henry Reed, of Pennsylvania. See Ninth Report of the Smithsonian Institution.

† As quoted by Professor Reed.

road, build a bridge, or open a mine, without the authority of the 'Ministre des Ponts et Chaussées.' In Ireland, there being much more Celtic than Anglo-Saxon blood, no self-reliance is felt, and a disposition prevails to throw every thing upon the government."

"Even with regard to metropolitan influences," says Professor Reed, "how obvious is it that London has never been to England what Paris has been and is to France, whether royal, imperial, or republican France." It has been said by Dr. Arnold, that "centralization and active life pervading the whole body are hard to reconcile; he who should do this perfectly would have established a perfect government. * * * It seems to be a law that life cannot long go on in a multitude of minute parts without union, nay, even without something of that very centralization which yet, if not well watched, is so apt to destroy the parts by absorbing their life into its own; there must be a heart in the political as in the natural body to supply the extremities continually with fresh blood."

This Saxon characteristic of local institutions, taken in connection with their diversities of character and traditional influences, which the assimilating processes of many centuries "have only smoothed down, but not altered," affords an instructive view of the elemental foundations of the

American Union.

These elements were to be prepared and advanced by causes whose processive cycle covered more than a millennial period before they were matured for transmission and development to a newly-discovered continent, whose distant locality, and whose lines of mountains and rivers, were marked out for one people. It was not to be the mission of the Scandinavian navigators, whose early motives were limited to the mere spirit of discovery; nor of Spain, or of Portugal, whose adventurers sought only to advance Catholicism, or to enlarge and enrich material possessions; nor of France, whose partial and temporary footholds upon the continent sought only extended empire and control. Whatever element was fitted to make a part of the new empire, whenever and wherever generated, was saved, combined, advanced, and incorporated with the great encircling process transferred to the western hemisphere. Whatever was discordant or adverse to the germ of republican nationality was rejected and excluded. The period of colonization had not been reached when Columbus lived, but was placed in the seventeenth century — an age characterized by high motives of individual thought, vigor, and responsibility, and by conventional developments of principle. The repellent process of diversity was commenced and continued under the varied forms of royal, proprietary, and chartered governments, and at the same time constantly guarded by a centralizing spirit, which rather saw means of defence in proscription and exclusion, than safety in any consolidated system of control. The

Protestant element in its diversity severed the church from the trammels of state, and freedom was given to religion. The antipathies between England and France were ever present to exclude all disturbing elements which threatened the peace and unity of the people, while it was the result of the English revolution of 1688 to harmonize the Dutch colonists with the subjects of the crown, when Holland gave a sovereign to Great Britain.* The plans of Cromwell to connect New England with Jamaica, and of Franklin to link the destiny of Ireland, and of the provinces, and West India Islands with that of America, were rejected by an instinctive wisdom, too far-sighted to be less than providential. Royalty and democracy were poised upon an even balance, and watched with a sleepless vigilance. The elements of diversity and uniformity were guarded in separate divisions, preparatory to ultimate combinations, and from motives of political and religious duty; and thus, in due time, the colonists were scattered to subdue and control their new and extended territory. A combination of people, representing different nations, was commenced; each characterized by peculiar elements, and all uniting the indispensable requisites for a newer and higher political organization, only to be found practicable on a republican basis. The humble though intelligent people, invested with no power above their confidence in God and love of freedom, were prepared to banish themselves from their native homes, where progress had become impossible by accumulations of conservative opinion, to a vast and distant land, — fresh from the hands of the Deity, — where only barbarism reigned in solitary ferocity and unproductiveness, that civilization might follow in greater glory. They came to America representative men, necessary to the beginning of a great nation. They selected for themselves each a circle and a locality, which apparently at first only satisfied individual preference or opinion, but which in the end will lead to physical unity embracing the whole continent. "The continent," said New Jersey to the Continental Congress, in 1776, "should defend the continent." At early periods distinct colonies had marked their boundaries and established their governments. Each colony with an equal independence guarded its own rights, and claimed a separate control of its own affairs. For a period of a century and a half they multiplied in the midst of struggles and hardships, and were joined by sympathizing companions from all climes. They were nursed and reared by "a wise and salutary neglect" of the mother country, until the germinal period was passed, to be succeeded by the birth of a new republic, —

The Republic of the United States.

The centralization of political power was looked upon by all alike with fearful apprehension. The principle of distinctive local gov-

* Professor Reed.

ernment, so early favored by the Saxons, was at work within the narrow channels of these kindred Puritan colonies, and no adequate motive for an independent union had yet been presented. That there was an impatient jealousy of the centralizing authority of Massachusetts may be seen in the keen remark of the Plymouth agent in London to the Governor of Plymouth, in 1691, who thus expressed himself with evident temper: "All the frame of heaven moves upon one axis, and the whole of New England interest seems designed to be loaden on one bottom, and her particular motion to be concentric to the Massachusetts tropic. You know who are wont to trot after the bay horse."

What required centuries to begin took generations to mature. During the long period of preparation and discipline, when the varied elements of nationality, of the past and present, were in process of combination, the great principle of union was gradually developed. The people stood forth in their native dignity, and began to study the laws and conditions of the society in which God had placed them. Separately and alike each colony saw its dependence upon the crown, and together the rightful necessity of union, which was the last step preceding nationality. "Nothing will save us," said Gadsden of South Carolina, "but acting together; the province that endeavors to act separately must fall with the rest, and be branded, besides, with everlasting infamy."

It is a beautiful truth, that no new assumption of power is permitted by Providence without a season of practical trial. Such a test has the double purpose of proving and adding to the largeness of capacity. The child was required by its mother practically to prove its majority, and the proof became the source of pride both to the parent and the offspring, gave new hopes to humanity, and commanded the scrutiny of an admiring world. Here arose a union of sovereignties, each more complete in itself, as a part of a great whole, than had ever existed; each forging a link within a link, and all making a chain which generations and centuries may test and strain, but cannot break. The gradual formation and growth of such a union, deriving its strength and power from such a diversity of inexhaustible sources, becomes at once the subject of the deepest interest and highest importance. Having occasion, fourteen years ago, to speak of it, I ventured to use the following language: "Every true friend of liberty finds a subject of congratulation in THE INDISSOLUBLE NATURE OF THE UNION. This indissoluble combination of sovereignties of a gradual and similar formation is one of those extraordinary events of time, in which all may recognize the ruling hand of Providence. Such a union is one of inconceivable strength and permanency. We can see the elements of its growth, but we cannot even predict the beginning of the causes of its decay. It is enveloped in almost numberless circles of sovereignty. Its heart cannot be reached by danger. Towns, counties, states, and their unnum-

bered institutions, have each their own independent sphere of action, and their growing and diversified strength is a perpetual source of power to the Union. They are limbs of the great body politic. Their various modes of action, and the manifestation of their different views, sentiments, interests, and prejudices, are but the exercise necessary to their own growth, and to the healthy condition of that great body of which they are members. Its duration cannot be measured by man. The combined action of enemies without, and the assaults of party spirit within, can have no tendency but to develop new energies and to add new strength. It may rise in its grandeur and might for centuries to come; have its periods of growth and decay, its blessings and its troubles; but its changes can only be those of progress. Dissolution may be discussed, threatened, and, possibly, even attempted; but every discussion will increase the knowledge of the indispensable necessity of union, every threat will add to the zeal of its friends, and every attempt to subvert it will create new safeguards for its protection and perpetuity. The physical world in its variety, and the mental world in its unity, encircle its boundaries and centralize its interests. THE DISSOLUTION OF SUCH A UNION IS A MORAL IMPOSSIBILITY."*

Subsequent studies have only strengthened and confirmed the opinions which were then formed, and I look upon the government of the United States of America, under the Constitution, AS THE STRONGEST AND MOST LIKELY TO BE PERMANENT OF ANY UPON THE FACE OF THE EARTH. Its testing vicissitudes open new avenues to truth, and add new means to experience. The sad and calamitous war which now threatens the ruin of the material interests of the people, and to embitter their future intercourse, painful and destructive as it is and must be, does not warrant desponding conclusions in the mind of the Christian patriot. When viewed with a patient and dispassionate judgment, and taken in connection with the events of the past, the wants of the future, and the renovating forces of progress, we find new and consoling evidence that our beloved country is destined to a continued advancement in power and responsibility, and according to those great and eternal laws of growth which give shape and vitality to all nations appointed to stand as beacons to a benighted world. It would be inconsistent with the unchangeable laws of progress, and with our acquired knowledge of things, to look for special exemptions from the conditions of humanity; or to suppose that our people are above the discipline so necessary to the wise use of knowledge, the control of passion, the rebuke of selfishness, the avoidance of error incident to pride and apathy, to the development of virtue and integrity, and above all, to that Christian patriotism, which, though extensively professed, is lamentably neglected, and to many even unknown.

* The Republic of the United States, &c., 1848.

National Progress, Causes of Disunion.

The progress of our country has been truly wonderful and unexampled. The foresight and wisdom of our fathers in the establishment of a government so proper, so simple, efficient, and just; the enterprise and industry of the people in creating for themselves a thriving business and happy homes; the cultivation of good will at home and abroad, and the realization of civil and religious liberty, — embracing all the privileges which tend to make existence noble, happy, and successful, — are among the countless blessings, which, like sunshine and rain, have been combined and dispensed so constantly and bountifully, by a God of love, to the American people, that they had almost begun impiously to think that Omnipotence waited upon their will alone, and had ceased to be an attribute of Jehovah! Liberty was loved better than understood. Prosperity had blinded the people to the great sources of success, the conditions of duty; and they had become arrogantly indifferent to the relations of dependence upon divine aid. Humility gave way to self-conceit; and fanaticism, clothed and disguised in the habiliments of charity, sought to compete with Providence in furnishing improved means of human progress. For the period of an entire generation a small portion of the people of New England, and of the free States, have constantly denounced the Constitution of our fathers as "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell," and have asked for a dissolution of the Union; they have stigmatized their southern brethren with dishonoring epithets, and, directly or indirectly, stolen their servants; they have encouraged nullification of laws when not in conformity to their views, and the enactment of unconstitutional laws when and where they could control; they have instigated rebellion and armed invasion, and they have honored the head of treason with the crown of martyrdom; they have made the churches the arena of vulgar doubt and political strife, and they have encouraged their religious teachers to prostitute their calling by raising the standard of party above that of the cross; they have resorted to fiction and misrepresentation, to inordinate zeal and mistaken philanthropy, and thus have scattered the seeds of disloyalty, sedition, and insurrection, and although claiming for themselves the prerogatives of conscience, they have denied them to others; they have endeavored to degrade the government by ignominious terms when faithful to the Constitution, and they have taught their children, and influenced their dependants and neighbors, to regard the observance of the Sabbath day of freedom as a sin, so long as their unconstitutional requisitions were rejected as impracticable; and, instead of scrutinizing themselves and inculcating a Christian charity, they have sought to control the opinions and business of others with an arrogant claim to infallibility, denying to men and to States equal rights and constitutional freedom. It is well known that the class holding to these ultra views is not

numerous, and, were it not that they have been aided and encouraged by others, of whose motives God alone can judge, would have been powerless. In giving these brief details I have endeavored faithfully to cite from the record. It is my purpose, in this connection, only to enumerate the many abuses and neglects, by citizens of all classes and of all parties, of the great privileges which they have so long enjoyed under the protecting power of the Union.

State governments have long been guilty of ignorance and gross neglect in not giving their time and attention to the importance of military organizations. The military has often been denominated as an obsolete institution, even barbarous and useless, unsuited to the character of the age, or to the wants of humanity. Its officers have been slighted and ridiculed as vain idlers, without high motives; its friends have been jeered and characterized as mere lovers of parade, and its trappings condemned as unmeaning gewgaws to trick distinction and outward show. Citizens of all classes, conditions, and degrees of respectability have deemed it meritorious and fashionable to decline office, to evade a citizen's responsibility, to depreciate officials, to sneer at government and political parties, to decline discussion of subjects concerning the public good, and to neglect the ballot box; to regard their own business as paramount to that of the nation, and to disparage the rejoicings and festivities designed to mark and celebrate great events as incentives to principle and patriotism. Some, who have been overtaken by the calamitous results of their own selfishness and apathy, have impatiently wished to see a chief magistrate appointed for life, or during good behavior; while others, forgetting their fathers, and urged by ungrateful impulses, and blinded by a heartless pride, have even invoked the presence of deposed royalty! The number of such men is small; but the fact that there are *any such* has an instructive significance in a general survey of causes which tend to anarchy and disunion. It is, indeed, humiliating to be obliged to confess the prevalence of a grumbling and ungrateful spirit, the national sins of ignorance and indifference, and an obvious disposition on the part of many to claim all and control all with too little regard to the rights of the people, and to the equal rights of the States. All profess to be proud of what the country has been and done; and yet how many are ungratefully insensible to those to whose foresight, wisdom, and labors they are indebted for its achievements and prosperity. Our brethren, too, of

THE SOUTHERN STATES

are called upon to review their record, and to correct their errors. Placed in a different locality and climate, and burdened with an inferior race to provide for, they have succeeded admirably in systematizing an industry adapted to their capacity, and which has proved to be of the utmost importance both to the nation and

to the world. The demands of barbarism became linked with the wants of civilization, and the rude sons of Africa were placed in Christian society. If the African race is to be saved and elevated, the great fact will be demonstrated in the Southern States of America. The fathers of New England, more than a century and a half ago, dismissed the problem of their capacity for freedom when they enacted laws in Connecticut and Massachusetts that their emancipation could not be permitted without bonds of security from their masters, in the sum of fifty pounds, that they should not become the source of expense to the towns where they were held. A race wanting in capacity rises only as it is helped. To be placed in competition with a superior is its death. Feeble-minded indigent white men and women are provided for by law during life. This is deemed a Christian necessity in all civilized nations. Slavery, as such, is favored by no one, nor is it created and established by legislation. It is an inequality of condition, or evil, found by civilization, and all nations are required by the commands of Christianity to regulate it with motives to paternal guardianship. A people capable of freedom cannot be enslaved, and an incapable people cannot be made free. Slavery was nominally abolished, long ago, in Mexico; but the smallest debt legally holds the spiritless Mexican in permanent servitude. Hundreds of millions of human beings are yet to be reached by Christianity, and rescued from ignorance, heathenism, cannibalism, barbarism; and this great duty can be accomplished only by slow degrees, and according to the measure of means of civilized nations. Servitude is a condition incident to humanity. No people have been exempted from its momentous requisitions, no age has been spared from the heavy burdens which it ever imposes upon society where it prevails. South Carolina was the first colony to protest against it to the king, but royalty then permitted no colonial discretion. In August, 1774, North Carolina passed a resolution, "That we will not import any slave or slaves, or purchase any slave or slaves imported or brought into this province by others, from any part of the world, after the first day of November next."

The slavery of Africa overshadows freedom, and slavery there is a perpetual condition, without the hope of improvement from internal means; while slavery in the United States (or rather a system of servitude) is, or should be, a condition of progress, a state of pupilage in the school of Christianity. The hero who is to carry the blessings of Christianity to Africa has already his pioneers in Liberia, and, when the proper time arrives, will find his capable followers in the Southern States of America.

With respect to the subject of *extending* slavery, it is to be observed that the great truths of democracy are not of a *territorial* nature, but moral. Practical views upon this subject were expressed by Jefferson, in a letter to Lafayette, in 1820. Speaking of the Missouri Compromise question, he says, "It is not a moral question, but one merely of power. Its object is to raise a geo-

graphical principle for the choice of a president; and the noise will be kept up till that is effected. All know that permitting the slaves of the South to spread into the West will not add one being to that unfortunate condition; that it will increase the happiness of those existing, and, by spreading them over a larger surface, will dilute the evil every where, and facilitate the means of getting finally rid of it — an event more anxiously wished by those on whom it presses than by the NOISY PRETENDERS to exclusive humanity."

The magnitude of this subject cannot be over-estimated; and when considered in its diversified relations, it will be found to be a cause above and beyond the appointment of man entirely to control, or to adjust with misguided hopes of finality.

But, while this form of servitude may be considered as friendly to the African, and benevolently suited to develop his naturally lymphatic constitution, and to relieve his condition of ignorance, it must not be regarded an element of nationality. It is incidental only to the great sources of national growth and completeness. Properly speaking, it is neither sectional nor national. It is a conditional attribute of humanity, necessary, it may be, to unfold and to establish, by comparison and appreciation, the progressive means of freedom. The American Union can be perpetuated only on the ground of equality, and any deviation from this standard is an inevitable tendency to disunion. Entire equality —nominal, moral, political, and industrial equality—is an indispensable condition of perpetual union. This condition of equality has been too much neglected by all of the States. Although the industry of the North and South is largely and reciprocally advantageous, yet the South has employed too much the operatives of the North to be true to itself. It has relied too much upon the shops and the mills, upon the schools and institutions of New England. These, in a greater degree, the Southern States want in their own midst, — so that all the elements of character may be found where their influence is most needed. Means of progress cannot be borrowed by the people of a commonwealth; they cannot be purchased, — they must make a part of it. Each State has its own heart, and it must grow its own blood, and have its own veins and arteries. South Carolina can best take care of herself when her sister States are true to themselves. What is true of one is true of all. State sovereignty comprehends all duties to the Union, and all duties to itself as a distinct part of the Union. Without State sovereignty permanent union would be impossible, from the want of an adequate basis. Without union State rights would be impossible, from the want of elements of national growth and defence. The Union constitutes a part of every State, and every State a part of the Union, and the means of preserving each are to be found in unreserved duty to each State in accordance with reserved rights, and to the Union according to the Constitution. The laws of the Southern States which

prohibit the education of the slaves, which imprison colored seamen visiting their ports, or which are merely retaliatory on abolitionists, not only tend to disunion, but to weaken the means of protecting the rights of the States. By such measures they have done injustice to themselves, and have added to the frenzied zeal of the abolitionist. Abolitionists have lived in all ages, and their varied missions will not be exhausted while the work of progress remains unfinished. If understood, they are not to be feared. When noticed most, they succeed best. They are pioneers, not settlers. They take but little part in the practical business of society. Like the Daniel Boones, if reached by society to-day, they will be found to-morrow beyond its limits, still exploring the wilderness.

The presence of the African upon this continent leads to the discussion of freedom to an extent, and in a manner, that would have been impossible if he had remained with his fathers. All nations, particularly republics, require exercise, as much as men and animals, to secure the highest conditions of health and vigor; and without the presence of an inferior race, having no nation, no home, but that of barbarism, we should have no special occasion either to look at the necessity of servitude, or to study the conditions of freedom. This grand exercise, thus providentially imposed upon us by a God who has commanded duties to the heathen, will result in knowledge of the great principles of liberty, and add strength to the American Union.

Thus far it has been the mission of the abolitionist, in America, — I say it with no motive to disparagement, — to elicit discussion, and to prevent the too sudden freedom of the slave. To prove this it is only necessary to look at the history of the emancipation movements in Kentucky, Virginia, and Maryland. If the abolitionist succeeds, his success will be the removal or the end of the African race. Successful emancipation is a domestic result, — and it cannot be accomplished by measures of external force. Besides, it would be, as a remedy for existing evils, in violation of the Constitution. It would divide the north, justify the south, paralyze the government, and prove destructive to the great industrial interests of the nation. But it is not our purpose so much to speak of remedies as to discover principles. By asking too much the abolitionist has accomplished nothing according to his own wishes; and for others he has instigated a practical inquiry, aided by the horrors of revolution, that will end in additional strength both to the Southern States and to our glorious Union. Not by force alone, but by securing that practical unity, "which results," to use the language of Guizot, "not from the identity of government and destiny, but from the similarity of institutions, manners, ideas, sentiments, languages; the unity which resides in the men themselves, whom the society unites together, and not in the forms of their junction; moral unity, in point of fact, far superior to political unity, and which alone can give it a solid foundation."

Progressive Periods of Union.

In progress there are two alternating processes of growth, progressive and conservative; an advance and then a pause for consolidation and maturity, preparatory to another step. In the growth of all nations these distinctive periods may be seen, and it is to be regretted that historians have neglected to note them with a profitable accuracy. Some of the principal periods of progressive union, in America, as conventionally made known, and which, with profit, may be noted by the student, are, 1643, 1690, 1743, 1754, 1763, 1774, 1787, 1800, 1812, 1820, 1832, 1844, 1850, and 1860, embracing conflicts developing the multiplying conditions necessary to actual conventional existence,— enlargement, defence, support, protection of persons and property, the enjoyment of equal rights and religious freedom, the security of State rights and of the Union, the broad enforcement of duty and of national control, both at home and abroad. The gradual development of these advancing conditions may be seen in the events of an increasing responsibility, in new wants which arose with an augmenting population, and in new necessities which were created by accumulating diversities. Every new step of advancement has been preceded by a declaration of principles, and followed by dissent and discussion, — an exercise indispensably necessary to the condition of a free people. Disunion was threatened as early as 1650, and with but little visible cessation to the present time, — though urged with different motives, and connected with different circumstances. Union was alternately favored and denounced by the Crown and by the colonies, by the Parliament and by the people, and always according to supposed rights or interests of royalty or democracy. If we turn to the history of this progressive principle in America, we shall find its accumulating tendencies all converging to a higher and to a stronger union. It not only rejects all elements of a nature incompatible with perfect and ultimate unity, but, by challenged controversy, renders the development of truth and strength an unavoidable result. From these considerations we are naturally led to inquire concerning

The Mission of Secession.

Incidental to these periods of conventional union we find the process of secession. The office of secession may be denominated the Providential means of developing great and practical truths necessary to the advancement of society, and to the government of nations. It is antagonistic to the principle of union. It claims division of territory, population, and interests, on supposed grounds of general good. Sectional interests and diversities of character are looked upon as incompatible with unity, and adverse to the obvious means of success and prosperity. It is asserted as a right

based upon the attributes of justice, and as a remedy for existing evils incident to consolidation. When asserted in conformity to the principles of progress, whether by consent or by revolution, it is successful. When asserted against progress, in the nature of things, it is impossible. All such attempts serve to illustrate the greater wants of humanity, and ultimately to provide for them. They tend to establish more fully and more firmly the legitimate means of progress, which, in vain, secession endeavors to subvert or destroy. Secession is no new doctrine; its claims have been asserted in all nations, during all time, and with uniform results, and in harmony with fundamental laws which can neither be modified nor repealed.

When colonies become sufficiently prepared for nationality, their secession from the parent government is a natural process, and cannot be prevented. If attended with circumstances of revolution, it will be found that they were necessary to success. A people leaving an old centre of organized activity, and seeking to establish a new one, needs the process of consolidation, that the parts may be joined in new relations, and the resulting union understood. A new sphere has been created, a new standard erected, a new government organized. All eyes are necessarily turned to the requisitions of the new standard, all hearts are required to beat in harmony with the pulsations of the new centre of national life, and all attacks from without help to develop the means of defence and advancement within. At no time have these principles been more fully demonstrated than at the period of the American revolution. All ultimate results of success, it must be remembered, are founded upon the immutable principles of justice. By demanding too much, Great Britain ceased to be a true guardian, and the colonies asserted the control of their own resources, and became a nation. By unlawfully attempting to subjugate the colonies, the government of Great Britain severed the ties of kindred and friendship, developed American character, and established the American Union. Without the external pressure of the war of Great Britain against the colonies, their independence could not have been achieved. Small in number, scattered over a vast continent, and without ready means to overcome obstacles of distance, or to meet in council, and having no interests in common but those of freedom, the colonists were without sufficient motives to unite upon a central policy, except for defence against a stronger force without, when union became a necessity. Hence, the war of Great Britain against the colonies, however characterized by the desolations of injustice and deadly strife, became the "scourge of men's iniquity," and the fearful instrument by which the new republic was to open its vast resources of material power and mental vigor. By the force of invasive war, men became invested with the responsibilities of citizenship, and slowly discovered the dread necessities of national existence. Each home was newly hallowed by the family, each colony by

the recital of its rights, and the continent by unfolding the Flag of the Union, — all were made more sacred, and guarded with more vigilance, by the presence of merciless war. By war the nation was made to stand alone.

Just after the declaration of peace, and at subsequent periods, the question of secession came up, as between a State and a portion of the State, and between a State and the Federal Government. The weakness of the first confederation was so obvious that no remedy was seen by many but by a division of the Union into two or three confederacies; and, by diversities of interest and opinion, several of the larger States were in danger of being reduced to fragments. Even after the adoption of the Constitution a portion of the States were slow to discover their own weakness, or to appreciate the value of a national government. Most of the States had their divisions, in endeavors to improve their governmental machinery, and some of them saw no safety but in themselves. John Hancock and the legislature of Massachusetts, in 1789, regarded the dignity of the governor of the Commonwealth, within its own boundaries, as above that of Washington, as President, and the interests of the State as paramount to those of the Union. North Carolina, for a season, was "an exile." Rhode Island was so perverse that it was hoped that she would be excluded, and her "territory divided between her neighbors;" Vermont, (from 1777 to 1790,) surrounded by powerful claimants, and distracted by divided counsels and conflicting interests, nobly asserted her sovereignty and independence, while she neutralized the hostile threats of Congress by negotiations with Great Britain; and as late as 1794, Kentucky had "a powerful faction for placing that country under the protection of the British government, and separating from the union of the States." When the question of the admission of Louisiana was under discussion in Congress, a distinguished member, from Massachusetts, opposed the measure, in strong language, — for which he was rebuked by Mr. Poindexter, of Mississippi. He said, "I am compelled to declare it as my deliberate opinion, that, if this bill passes, the bonds of this Union are virtually dissolved; that the States which compose it are free from their moral obligations, and that, as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, to prepare definitely for separation, — amicably if they can, violently if they must."

It was not till 1812 that the American nation was required to strengthen its external relations with foreign powers, by asserting its sovereignty and nationality against the aggressive acts of England. This was called by Jefferson the necessary hooping of the nation. It was then that the doctrine of secession was promulgated by prominent men of New England, and the right to make a separate peace with England, and to establish a New England confederacy, was openly declared and defended. A few of the surviving royalists of the revolution, still clinging to theories

favorable to the return of a monarchical government, did not hesitate to encourage secession as a disorganizing process necessary to the realization of their wishes. Flags of five stripes were displayed as representing what was derisively called the "Kingdom of New England." States were influenced by executive authority to oppose the measures of the Federal government, and conventions were called to meet in secret conclave, not to coöperate with the President in prosecuting the war, but to denounce and oppose it with bitterness and misrepresentation. "Let no considerations whatever, my brethren," said an eminent divine of Boston, "deter you at all times, and in all places, from execrating the present war. As Mr. Madison has declared war, let Mr. Madison carry it on. The Union has been long since virtually dissolved, and it is full time that this part of the *Disunited* States should take care of itself." Other clergymen were equally violent. The control of the troops was denied to the Federal authority, prisons were closed against the executive of the Union, loans were refused by capitalists and banks under dishonoring threats, and petty embarrassments were multiplied in every possible way to discourage and weaken the government by partisans who had not sufficient foresight to appreciate its policy, or patriotism to submit to sacrifices necessary to sustain the dignity of the nation.

It is an interesting truth to be noted, that while some of the most gifted sons of New England, with high and patriotic motives, entertained impracticable opinions, the mass of the people were true to their country according to the measure of their information. When fully informed, the people not only correct their own errors, but rebuke their mistaken leaders. What was then true of the North will be found true of the South. When the people of the Southern States are made fully aware of the terrible dangers of secession, they will act as one man, and turn from them with permanent aversion.

In 1820, the admission of Missouri became an important question as connected with the Union. "This momentous question," said Jefferson, "like a fire-bell in the night, awakened and filled me with terror. I considered it at once as the knell of the Union. It is hushed, indeed, for the moment. But this is a reprieve only, not a final sentence. A geographical line, coinciding with a marked principle, moral and political, once conceived and held up to the angry passions of men, will never be obliterated; and every new irritation will mark it deeper and deeper." Washington saw the dangers of such a conflict, and uttered his prophetic warning; but fanaticism disdains to regard either the counsels of wisdom or of experience. When Texas was annexed, and war was made against Mexico; when the "compromise measures" of 1850 were passed, partisans and States saw destruction in progress, and safety in disunion. Indeed, disunion has always been the cry of desperate men and parties, when not successful, *in terrorem;* and this enduring fact affords conclusive evidence that no greater evil is deemed possible to the nation.

As the election of Abraham Lincoln to the presidency was in strict conformity to the requisitions of the Constitution, and as the seceding States have not preferred charges of violated faith against the Federal government itself, it follows that secession is claimed either as a constitutional right, and as consistent with State sovereignty, or as a necessary remedy against great evils too intolerable to be borne, and therefore justifying revolution. First, let us consider

Secession as a Constitutional Right.

To judge accurately of a constitutional right, we should look not only to the plain provisions of the Constitution itself, but to the meaning of the events which preceded its formation — the germinating elements of its origin. Without adverting to the teachings of the various unions illustrative of the progress of the republic, we will only refer to the Declaration of Independence, and to subsequent events immediately preceding the period when the Constitution was adopted.

In the Declaration of Independence the fundamental principles of freedom and constitutional rights were asserted, and upon this broad basis legitimate claims for justice were made, against long and permanent abuses and grievances, which were formally enumerated and plainly set forth as sufficiently justifying, before the world, a revolutionary appeal to arms. In this document two great facts are recorded, important to be noted and remembered.

1st, A recognition of national sovereignty in the British Crown *anterior* to the time of the convention which made the Declaration; and,

2d, The transfer of that sovereignty to the joint authority of the colonies, in convention assembled by the voice of the people, as States, which, when united under a Constitution, represented the same prerogatives of which the Crown had been divested.

By this statement it will be seen that to the colonial system, the revolution added a new element to be defined and systematized, and that was national sovereignty. The prerogatives of royalty were taken from the prince, and placed in the keeping of the people. It then became the study of the fathers of the new republic so to control this additional element that each State should preserve its own political identity, and that all should stand in relation to it as equals. As the States widely varied in population, industry, and interests, it became a difficult problem so to concentrate this newly-acquired sovereignty as to establish a Union based upon conditions of practical equality. The Union became the executive of the people, and it was authorized to exercise this newly-acquired power, and to control such other agencies, as the people, by convention, should deem expedient or important. The complex nature of a sovereignty authorized and shared by independent States is not readily defined, particularly by representatives of

States, who constantly fear reserving too little, or conceding too much. That these representatives were careful and conservative, may be seen in all the

Discussions upon the Constitution.

From November 1777 to July 1778 the first plan of the Confederation was formed, and eight States had assented to it, although with many and conflicting objections. Discussions were continued upon it till March, 1781, when all the States but Rhode Island had substantially ratified it, though with reserved and reluctant modifications. The grave and formal objections set forth by the assembly of Rhode Island were duly answered, and with much ability, by a committee of Congress, consisting of Messrs. Madison, Hamilton, and Fitzsimmons. But, while this committee labored to show that Rhode Island was wrong, in part, it was practically found by the people and Congress, that the plan, as a whole, was inadequate to meet the emergencies of the crisis. The country was without revenue or credit, and its foreign trade without control. The wants of the army were neglected, and permitted to accumulate with new aggravations, and creditors became clamorous for the payment of their claims. Government was distracted by counsels emanating alike from extreme motives of selfishness and of patriotism, and the people were in a despondingmood, all asking protective action, and but few manifesting a practical spirit of compromise. From 1781 to 1787, Congress, again and again, proposed modified plans of union, and States as often reported upon them differently and with no common agreement. Some approved in part, some offered substitutes, some despaired of agreement, or neglected to act, while others acted partially or conditionally. Some favored temporary experiments, some proposed perpetual arrangements, and others a subdivided authority, or an undivided sovereignty. This long period of discussion was also a period of trial. Measures were practically tested before they were fully or finally adopted. Doubts were removed by actual tests, and ascertained weaknesses remedied by additional provisions of efficiency. Step by step the wants of the people, and of the nation, were noted, measures were gradually adjusted to meet them, and by degrees the States found by actual experiment the necessity of investing the Union with all those elements of power which constitute nationality. In these discussions it will be seen that from the smallest to the greatest concessions of power, the States were eminently conservative, yielding nothing to the federal government that could be consistently withheld. They began with weakness, and only consented to additional power as it became an imperative necessity. There seemed to be but one motive and one wish, and that was, to render the Union perfect and efficient, and with no particle of excess of power, thus combining a careful judgment with an actual experience. In

these discussions, from first to last, great principles were recognized, which favored the efficiency and perpetuity of the Union, and excluded the possibility of weakness or secession. The condition of things, at this period, may be inferred from the language of Washington, in a letter to a member of Congress dated 1780. "I see," said he, "one head gradually changing into thirteen. I see one army branching into thirteen, which, instead of looking up to Congress as the supreme controlling power of the United States, are considering themselves as dependent on their respective States. I am fearful of the consequences." "Before this Constitution was adopted," says Mr. Webster, "the United States had already been in a union, more or less close for fifteen years." He might have said with truth, more or less close for nearly a century and a half. In speaking of the aversion of many to the Constitution, Patrick Henry said, "A government without the affections of the people can be neither durable nor happy. But, Sir, I mean not to breathe the spirit nor utter the language of secession."

As no provision is made for secession in the body of the Constitution itself, — an indispensable provision if secession had been intended — it should seem to be almost an act of supererogation to refute a doctrine not any where stated in terms. I am led to believe that it is neither warranted by the Constitution, nor by any collateral evidence to be found in the events or circumstances of its adoption. Besides, it would be inconsistent with those known laws of growth which lead to legitimate progress and unity. Even Calhoun did not countenance secession except as a remedial measure against an "act of the federal government unauthorized by the Constitution." There is much force in the remarks of the Duke of Argyle, in a recent speech upon American affairs, and he furnishes a most apt illustration of the peculiar process of secession. He said, "I do not care whether we look at it from the Northern or from the Southern point of view. Take the mere question of what is called the right of secession. I know of no government in the world which could possibly have admitted the right of secession from its own allegiance. There is a curious animal in Lochfyne, which I have sometimes dredged up from the bottom of the sea, and which performs the most extraordinary and unaccountable acts of suicide and self-destruction. It is a peculiar kind of star-fish, which, when brought up from the bottom of the water, and when any attempt is made to take hold of it, immediately throws off all its arms, its very centre breaks up, and nothing remains of one of the most beautiful forms in nature but a thousand wriggling fragments."

To admit of the right of secession, under a constitution, is projected dissolution, and in violation of well-known axioms of philosophy, which join cause and effect, and count the whole greater than a part. If secession is not warranted by the Constitution, it remains to be seen if it can be defended upon the grounds of revolution.

Revolution.

Revolution is defensible only as it protects the people in their legitimate rights against a tyranny. To rebel against the government merely with a view to control its measures, is like amputating a limb that it may be cured of an injury. To resort to revolution to remedy trifling evils, is as wise at it would be to destroy the body to eradicate incipient disease. That the Southern States had no occasion to resort to desperate remedies may be seen from the conservative vote of the people for President. The conservative vote was 2,804,570, and for the Republican candidate only 1,857,610, showing a difference of nearly a million voters against the party now in authority. Differences of opinion furnish no occasion for revolution; for by freedom of discussion a people become informed and a government improved.

All citizens owe dutiful allegiance to their own government: if it be in danger, to defend it; if it be weak, to strengthen it; if it be inadequate, to enlarge it; if it be wrong, to right it. Any course of a party not in harmony with these motives is adverse both to private interests and the public good. True patriotism is patient to know its own and to defend it, until nothing remains to be defended. It then becomes the mission of revolution to regain what has been lost.

Conceding as true all that the Southern States have charged against the Republican party, and the apologists of John Brown, a resort to revolutionary measures affords not only no remedy against the evils of which they complain, but it inevitably multiplies and aggravates them. That secession was not intended as an ordinary remedy for ordinary abuses, may be inferred from the fact that no such process was authorized, and the amending power was plainly provided in the Constitution as a rule for the adjustment of differences. The amending power, says Calhoun, "is, when properly understood, the *vis medicatrix* of the system; its great repairing, healing, and conservative power; intended to remedy its disorders, in whatever cause or causes originating; whether in the original errors or defects of the Constitution itself, or in the operation of time and change of circumstances, or in conflicts between its parts, including those between the coördinate governments."

The States are not only entitled to the benefit of their own constitutional means to remedy existing evils, but they have a constitutional claim upon the Federal government for active coöperation in promptly adopting whatever measures may be necessary for the general welfare and peace of the country. Having for their standard the Constitution of the United States, it is their high prerogative to command the full benefit of the authority of the Union. Indeed, there is no power adequate to afford relief except that to be found in the Union; and that will always be found reliable if time be given for the formation

of public opinion and for its corrective application. Separate confederacies established on secession foundations would have within them the sure elements of their own dissolution, and domestic evils would be converted into external and hopeless embarrassments. What is now regulated by a Constitution, with a great diversity of views, all promotive of a common interest, a common good, would have to be controlled and regulated by treaties, where the relations of interest and of a general welfare would have their extent narrowed and limited to their respective nationalties. The philanthropist would recognize no geographical boundary to humanity, and would extend his active benevolence to all lands where men were found in bondage, or where souls were to be saved. That fanatics would follow them hardly need be stated. Whether we have one or four nations, the continent remains, as before, marked by its mountains, rivers, and highways, and the people inhabiting it are still together as neighbors, and linked with great interests, which stand upon the same localities, and would have to be operated by means engendered in common, and worked by men of the same society. Fugitives from labor would have no greater distance to run, to be freed from their masters, and the same opportunities for aid would remain to be extended by their zealous sympathizers. What is now protected by constitutional law would then become free from conventional control, and the busy abolitionists would have no special occasion to seek for an apology to work for a principle where citizenship imposed upon them no restraints. Present evils, which are special, would be magnified by new relations of importance, and aggravated by litigious complications. The Southern States would lessen their resources, increase their burdens, and cripple their means of national advancement. The Northern would become more impracticable by concentrating within narrower limits the deluding results of a fanatical frenzy, and lose much both in interest and character by lessening their intercourse with intelligent communities, whose people would strive to direct their influence to a new centre. The whole country would be deprived of important elements which tend to a continental unity, and the subdivisions of territory, connected with inefficient and varying schemes of government, would lead to results too insignificant to protect the citizen at home, and too inadequate to command respect abroad. Separation would only illustrate a sad condition of weakness and anarchy, and demonstrate the imperative necessity of a speedy return to union.

In a recent speech of Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, he said, "That separation between Northern and Southern States, in America, which is now being brought about by civil war, I have long foreseen, and foretold to be inevitable; and I venture to predict that the younger men here will live to see not two, but at least four, and probably more than four, separate and sovereign commonwealths arising out of those populations which a year ago

united the legislature under one president, and carried their merchandise under a single flag. And so far from thinking that these separations will be injurious to the future destinies of America, or inflict a blow on that grand principle of self-government in which the substance of liberty consists, I believe that such separations will be attended with happy results to the safety of Europe and the development of American civilization."

That Sir Edward speaks with sincerity and with no unfriendly motive, I have no reason to doubt. He is a gentleman of great learning and much philosophy; and it is a gratifying privilege to place his testimony upon record in favor of self-government. If, however, he has been correctly reported, he has done himself injustice by venturing to utter opinions unaccompanied by information sufficient for their basis. He certainly cannot be ignorant of the important political events which led President Monroe, in 1823, "to declare that we should consider any attempt on the part of the allied powers to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." The course of France and of other continental powers, by interfering with the affairs of Spain, according to the doctrines proclaimed at Laybach, by the allied monarchs, in 1822, "that they had a right to interfere in the concerns of another state, and to reform its government, in order to prevent the effects of its bad example," was amply sufficient to warrant the declaration of the United States government that its future policy would be not only non-intervention, but uncompromisingly *continental.* Any other course would endanger the peace of the continent. If war, under any circumstances, be deemed necessary, either for the cause of justice or for the advancement of freedom, it must be adjusted to the high standard of the Union. Nothing less. To divide the Union into several commonwealths would inevitably lead to troublesome complications abroad and perpetual wars at home. It is better to fight for one flag for years, than to fight for different flags for centuries. "The strength and happiness of America must be continental, and not provincial; and whatever appears to be for the good of the whole, must be submitted to by every part: this holds true, and ought to be a governing maxim in all societies." This was the spirit of New Jersey in 1776, and it is the spirit of the people now.

It was the remark of Jefferson that "we have seldom seen neighborhood produce affection among nations. The reverse is almost the universal truth." This great truth was seen by Cowper:—

> "Lands intersected by a narrow frith
> Abhor each other. Mountains interposed
> Make enemies of nations who had else,
> Like kindred drops, been mingled into one."

"Neighboring nations," says an able writer, quoted by Hamilton, "are naturally ENEMIES of each other, unless their common weakness forces them to league in a CONFEDERATE REPUBLIC, and

their constitution prevents the differences which neighborhood occasions, extinguishing that secret jealousy which disposes all states to aggrandize themselves at the expense of their neighbors." Besides, frontier evils would be multiplied by subdivisions of territory, and should the views spoken of by the philosopher of Stagira prevail, disfranchisement would hardly prove to be one of the least. "Some states," says Aristotle, "have enacted that landholders living on the frontier should not be allowed to vote in questions concerning war and peace, because such persons are likely to sacrifice to private interest the advantage and honor of their country." In a letter to John Taylor, in 1798, upon the subject of disunion parties in Virginia and North Carolina, Mr. Jefferson says, "Perhaps this party division is necessary to induce each to watch and delate to the people the proceedings of the other. But if on a temporary superiority of the one party, the other is to resort to a scission of the Union, no federal government can ever exist. If to rid ourselves of the present rule of Massachusetts and Connecticut, we break the Union, will the evil stop there? Suppose the New England States alone cut off,— will our nature be changed? Are we not men still to the south of that, and with all the passions of men? Immediately we shall see a Pennsylvania and a Virginia party arise in the residuary confederacy, and the public mind will be distracted with the same party spirit. What a game, too, will the one party have in their hands, by eternally threatening the other, that, unless they do so and so, they will join their northern neighbors. If we reduce our Union to Virginia and North Carolina, immediately the conflict will be established between the representatives of these two States, and they will end by breaking into their simple units. Seeing, therefore, that an association of men who will not quarrel with one another is a thing which never yet existed, from the greatest confederacy of nations down to a town meeting or a vestry; seeing that we must have somebody to quarrel with, I had rather keep our New England associates for that purpose, than to see our bickerings transferred to others." Again, in a letter dated at Washington, March 22, 1801, he says, "The times have been awful, but they have proved a useful truth, that the good citizen must never despair of the commonwealth. How many good men abandoned the deck, and gave up the vessel as lost! It furnishes a new proof of the falsehood of Montesquieu's doctrine, that a republic can be preserved only in a small territory. The reverse is the truth. Had our territory been even a third only of what it is, we were gone."

When Sir Edward advises *four* commonwealths, it is obvious that he counts STATE SOVEREIGNTY as nothing. This is a great error. We have *thirty-four* independent States; and it is a singular feature of the present war, that its cause makes an element that will be found in the solution of peace. The North prosecutes the war in defence of the Union, and the South in defence of State

rights,—without which the preservation of the constitutional Union would be impossible. Thus both parties, but with widely different motives, are alike engaged in defending the same great principles of constitutional freedom. The fundamental principles of State rights constitute the solid foundation of the republic, and any deviation whatever from such a standard will tend to a consolidated tyranny. While the attempt at secession will lead the people to study the parts in relation to the whole, the threatened dangers to the Union will lead them to study the whole in relation to the parts. When the mangling process of separation shall be extended to the utmost limits of endurance, and the passions shall yield to manly patriotism, then differences will become hateful by association, and the affections, renovated by repose, will resume their sway.

The outlines of our governmental system were happily given by Jefferson, when president, in a letter to the General Assembly of Rhode Island, in 1801. "It is a momentous truth," said he, "and happily of universal impression on the public mind, that our safety rests on the preservation of our Union. Our citizens have wisely formed themselves into one nation as to others, and several States as among themselves. To the united nation belongs our external and mutual relations; to each State severally the care of our persons, our property, our reputation, and religious freedom. This wise distribution, IF CAREFULLY PRESERVED, will prove, I trust, from example, that while smaller governments are better adapted to the ordinary objects of society, LARGER CONFEDERATIONS more effectually secure independence and the preservation of REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT."

When the bitterness of controversy ends in

CIVIL WAR,

reason has exhausted her resources of manly adjustment. The passions are enthroned, impulse takes the place of motive, and frenzy precedes judgment. What man, as man, will not do, is deferred to the terrible results of battle. Principle rises to the dignity of influence when pride is humbled by a realizing sense of human weakness. When men fail to agree, and forget their frailty by assuming the uncompromising spirit of infallibility, they are permitted to demonstrate their blindness and to test their integrity. Confident of their intelligence, and unconsciously ignorant, each party is nerved to rush forward into the dark regions of death, invoking the aid of Omnipotence and wildly defying the power of man. To pause is cowardice, and to reflect is treason. The Christian standard of peace is obscured by the mists of passion, and man is doomed to the desolations of human wisdom, and to see for a time what existence would be without righteousness or the mercy of God. Parents, children, and friends are placed in antagonistic relations, and woman forgets to smile, and turns her

love to hate. Both in the North and in the South prominent men are singled out with a special view to hateful notoriety, as if representative men were wholly responsible for all that they are asked to do, or were specially bound, unlike all other men, to think without error and to act without sin. If Lincoln should cease to exist, who, of his party, could be found to serve his country with greater integrity? If Garrison and Phillips should be entombed with their fathers, who, of their class, could supply their place of zeal, and with more intelligence? If it should be the will of God to take to himself the spirits of Davis and Stephens, who of the South could be found among their followers to prosecute the war of secession with a higher sense of honor, or to negotiate a peace with a superior wisdom? Is it adding to the honor and glory of the nation to prove that any of the people within its broad domain are cowards, — to say so much of sectional courage?

When men fail to agree, human agency is apparently suspended, and by attentive observation we are enabled in some degree to understand how opposing forces may develop the errors of opinion, and how war may illustrate the unity of truth. We shall find in the experience of America what is true in the history of Europe. The greatest living thinker, Guizot, says, "In Asia, one class completely triumphed, and the government of castes succeeded to that of classes, and society sunk into immobility. Thank God, none of this has happened in Europe. Neither of the classes has been able to conquer or subdue the others; the struggle, instead of becoming a principle of immobility, has been a cause of progress: the relations of the principal classes among themselves; the necessity under which they found themselves of combating and yielding by turns; the variety of their interests and passions; the desire to conquer without the power to satisfy it, — from all this has arisen, perhaps, the most energetic and fertile principle of the development of European civilization. The classes have incessantly struggled; they detested each other; an utter diversity of situation, of interests, and of manners, produced between them a profound moral hostility; and yet they have progressively approached nearer, come to an understanding and assimilated; every European nation has seen the birth and development in its bosom of a certain universal spirit, a certain community of interests, ideas, and sentiments, which have triumphed over diversity and war."

Civil war is a war of differences between kindred and friends, and it can be ended only by a mutual understanding as to their causes, and the true remedies to be applied. Ignorance causes and submits to war, injustice inflicts its miseries, and suffering compels the attainment of practical knowledge as to the just means of peace. It may be a war of ambition or of duty, but not of destruction; a war of injustice or of conscience, but not of lasting hate.

Washington regarded the right of coercion an element of im-

perative necessity to the United States government; but he was at a loss to decide "what kind of coercion" would be best. Jefferson did not deem it necessary to give Congress the enforcing power, because they were entitled to it by the laws of nature. "When any one State in the American Union," he says, "refuses obedience to the confederation by which they have bound themselves, the rest have a natural right TO COMPEL them to obedience. Congress would probably exercise long patience before they would recur to force; but if the case ultimately required it, they would use that recurrence. Should this case ever arise, they will probably coerce by A NAVAL FORCE, as being more easy, less dangerous to liberty, and less likely to produce much bloodshed."

If war be inevitable, let patriotism characterize the battle, and magnanimity the councils of the nation. The cause of the Union is one of solemn grandeur, and no discordant levity or passionate bitterness should be permitted to deface its beauty. Every patriotic citizen should give to the government that prompt coöperation which shall render it before the world equal to its high duties, and acceptable even to its bitterest enemies. These enemies will soon be friends. Their months of failure will demonstrate centuries of success. The errors of a people may illustrate great truths, and even their sins may stand, by God's assistance, as beacons to warn posterity against like dangers. Patriotism is limited to no people, party, or section. It will be found in every State, and acknowledged by the people without the aid of chart or compass. The following stanzas taken from a beautiful ode which was sung at Charleston, S. C., July 4, 1832, will, we doubt not, ere long be repeated in that city, and with renewed devotion to the Union.

"Who would sever Freedom's shrine?
Who would draw the invidious line?
Though by birth one spot be mine,
Dear is all the rest:
Dear to me the South's fair land,
Dear the central mountain-band,
Dear New England's rocky strand,
Dear the prairied West.

"By our altars, pure and free,
By our Law's deep-rooted tree,
By the past's dread memory,
By our Washington,
By our common parent tongue,
By our hopes, bright, buoyant, young,
By the tie of country strong,
We will still be ONE."

Let the achievements of the government be marked by firmness, and by such sentiments as we find in the proclamations of Generals Dix, Sherman, and Halleck. "Force," says De Tocqueville, "is never more than a transient element of success; and after force comes the notion of right. A government which should only be able to crush its enemies upon a field of battle, would very soon be destroyed." "An unconquerable instinct," says Guizot, "warns governments that force does not found right, and

that if force was their origin, their right could never be established."

As no remedy can be found except in justice, let the government stand upon the immovable and eternal foundations of principle, as defined by the Constitution, and every struggle will add strength and dignity to the Union, and new hopes to humanity. "Where there is a right there is a remedy," is a sound maxim. In a letter, alluding to Shays's rebellion, from Paris, in 1787, Jefferson says, "We have had thirteen States independent for eleven years. There has been one rebellion. That comes to one rebellion in a century and a half for each State. What country before ever existed a century and a half without a rebellion? And can history produce an instance of rebellion so honorably conducted? I say nothing of motives. They were founded in ignorance, not wickedness. God forbid we should ever be twenty years without such a rebellion. The people cannot be all, and always, well informed. The part which is wrong will be discontented, in proportion to the importance of the facts they misconceive. If they remain quiet under such misconceptions, it is lethargy, the forerunner of death to the public liberty. What country can preserve its liberties, if its rulers are not warned, from time to time, that this people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. The remedy is to set them right as to facts, pardon, and pacify them."

The Union the Rock of Salvation.

So long as the people of the United States are united upon the great truth that the rock of their national salvation is the American Union, constitutionally preserved, they have every thing to hope and nothing to fear. The safety of Union and the dangers of disunion were seen by the fathers of the republic, and by their patriotic sons. The disunion of to-day has been caused by violations of the Constitution, by fanatics both in the North and the South, and the true remedy is to be found in a prompt return to its high requisitions of duty and practical equality. In the North, let it be seen that abolitionism is an impossible good, and at the South that secessionism is an impossible evil. Any further illegal attempt to accomplish either is to multiply dangers and to perpetuate war. After the adoption of the Constitution objection to slavery was too late. "It was disposed of," said Harrison Gray Otis, "in substance by the original Articles of Confederation, and annulled in form by the Constitution of the United States." It is not slavery that has produced this war, but an unconstitutional interference with it, joined with the heresy of secession. Leave slavery where it belongs by agreement, and the spirit of secession, appalled by its own enormities, so disproportioned to their cause, will recognize anew the sublime destiny of the Union, and joyously cease for ever. It is the duty of every citizen to understand the reality of State rights, and to respect them, and the impera-

ative necessity of constitutional union, and to defend it. These are plain and solid realities, upon which society can repose undisturbed by the speculative abstractions of impracticable schemes, and enjoy the comforts of duty and the exalted glories of religion.

What Washington wrote to Mr. Madison, in 1786 might be usefully repeated now as applicable to THIRTY-FOUR States. "Thirteen sovereignties," said he, "pulling against each other, and all tugging at the federal head, will soon bring ruin on the whole; whereas a liberal and energetic Constitution, well checked, and well watched to prevent encroachments, might restore us to that degree of respectability and consequence to which we had the fairest prospect of attaining." Again, in a letter to James McHenry, in Congress, he says, "I confess to you candidly, that I can foresee NO EVIL GREATER THAN DISUNION; than those unreasonable jealousies (I say *unreasonable*, because I would have a *proper* jealousy always awake, and the United States on the watch to prevent individual States from infracting the Constitution with impunity) which are continually poisoning our minds and filling them with imaginary evils for the prevention of real ones."

John Adams said, in 1809, "I am *totis viribus* against any division of the Union, by the North River, or by the Delaware River, or by the Potomac, or any other river, or by any chain of mountains. I am for maintaining the independence of the nation at all events." In a letter to Gerry, in 1797, in speaking of the horrors of disunion, Jefferson says, "Whatever follies we may be led into as to foreign nations, we shall NEVER give up our UNION, the last anchor of our hope, and THAT ALONE which is to prevent this heavenly country from becoming an arena of gladiators. Much as I abhor WAR, and view it as the greatest scourge of mankind, and anxiously as I wish to keep out of the broils of Europe, I would yet go with my brethren into these, rather than separate from them." Again, in noticing the dangers of disunion, during the period of the war of 1812, he said, "I do not believe there is on earth a government established on so immovable a basis. Let them in any State, even in Massachusetts itself, raise the standard of separation, and its citizens will rise in a mass and do justice to themselves on their own incendiaries." The legislative council of South Carolina, in an address to Governor Rutledge, 1776, used the following patriotic language: "The declaration of the Continental Congress, that 'the *United Colonies* are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States,' is a decree now worthy of AMERICA. We thankfully receive the notification of and rejoice at it; and we are determined at every hazard to endeavor to maintain it, that so, after we have departed, our children and their latest posterity may have cause to bless our memory." In the Virginia Convention of 1787, Governor Randolph asked, "Can Virginia exist without the Union? A hard question, perhaps, but I will venture, however, to say, SHE CANNOT." What he asserted he ably proved. Speaking of the motives of the patriots of the revolution, Mr. Calhoun says, "To dissolve the Union

was too abhorrent to be named." * * * "They regarded disunion and consolidation as equally dangerous, and were, therefore, equally opposed to both." In the United States Senate, 1850, Jefferson Davis said, "If I have a superstition, Sir, which governs my mind and holds it captive, it is a superstitious REVERENCE for the UNION. * * * If there is a dominant party in this Union which can deny to us equality, and the rights we derive through the Constitution, &c., this is not the Union for which our fathers pledged their property, their lives, and sacred honor." Governor Wise, of Virginia, on the 5th of July, 1858, said, "Listen to me now, and to what I am going to say. I wish that there was no noise, and that there was silence in all the earth, and that I had the trumpet of an archangel to sound it every where. When your fathers attempted to form this Union, they did not know beforehand what sort of a Union it was to be. But they went in for Union for Union's sake. They set to work to make the best Union they could, and they did make the best Union and the best government that ever was made. Washington, Franklin, Jefferson — all combined, in Congress or out of Congress, in convention or out of convention — never made that Constitution. God Almighty sent it down to your fathers. It was a work, too, of glory, and a work of inspiration. I believe that as fully as I believe in my Bible. No man, from Hamilton, and Jay, and Madison; from Edmund Randolph, who had the chief hand in making it, — and he was a Virginian; the writers of it, the authors of it, and you who have lived under it from 1789 down to this year of our Lord 1858, — none of your fathers, and none of your fathers' sons, has ever measured the height, or the depth, or the length, or the breadth of the wisdom of that Constitution." President Tyler, in 1844, sent a message to Congress, in which he uttered these words: "I regard the preservation of the Union as the first great American interest. I equally disapprove of all threats of its dissolution, whether they proceed from the North or the South. The glory of my country, its safety and its prosperity, alike depend on Union, and he who would contemplate its destruction, even for a moment, and form plans to accomplish it, deserves the deepest anathemas of the human race."

Thus we might quote volumes from the published views of influential men of all the States, from the period of the revolution to the present time; and while they express great differences of opinion as to the best mode of preserving the republic, all unite upon the great fact, embodied in the sentiment, that liberty upon the American continent can be preserved and defended only by THE AMERICAN UNION.

I have the honor to remain,
With great respect and true regard,
Your servant and friend,
NAHUM CAPEN.

Hon. PETER COOPER, New York.

71.2009.084.-2533